



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS
GREG ABBOTT

March 20, 2013

Mr. Stephen A. Cumbie
Assistant City Attorney
City of Fort Worth
1000 Throckmorton Street, 3rd Floor
Fort Worth, Texas 76102

OR2013-04560

Dear Mr. Cumbie:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under the Public Information Act (the "Act"), chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 482099 (City of Fort Worth PIR No. W022741).

The City of Fort Worth (the "city") received a request for all documents related to the winning proposals of five named vendors regarding request for proposals 08-0335. You state you have released some information to the requestor. Although the city takes no position regarding whether the submitted information is excepted from disclosure, you state release of this information may implicate the proprietary interests of Digital Intelligence Systems Corp. ("DISYS"); Hudson Global Resources Management, Inc. ("Hudson"); Matrix Resources, Inc. ("Matrix"); and Sentari Technologies, Inc. ("Sentari"). Accordingly, you provide documentation showing you have notified these companies of the request and their right to submit arguments to this office. *See Gov't Code § 552.305(d); see also Open Records Decision No. 542 (1990) (statutory predecessor to section 552.305 permits governmental body to rely on interested third party to raise and explain applicability of exception in the Act in certain circumstances).* We have received comments from DISYS and Sentari. We have considered the submitted arguments and reviewed the submitted information.

Initially, we note that an interested third party is allowed ten business days after the date of its receipt of the governmental body's notice to submit its reasons, if any, as to why information relating to that party should not be released. *See Gov't Code § 552.305(d)(2)(B).* As of the date of this decision, we have not received comments from Hudson or Matrix. Thus, we find neither of these third parties have demonstrated that they

have a protected proprietary interest in any of its submitted information. *See id.* § 552.110(a)-(b); Open Records Decision Nos. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (to prevent disclosure of commercial or financial information, party must show by specific factual evidence, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that release of requested information would cause that party substantial competitive harm), 552 at 5 (1990) (party must establish *prima facie* case that information is trade secret), 542 at 3. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of Hudson's or Matrix's information on the basis of any proprietary interest they may have in their information.

Next, we note DISYS seeks to withhold information the city did not submit for our review. Because such information was not submitted by the governmental body, this ruling does not address that information and is limited to the information submitted by the city. *See Gov't Code* § 552.301(e)(1)(D) (governmental body requesting decision from Attorney General must submit copy of specific information requested).

DISYS also contends its submitted information is not subject to disclosure under the Act because DISYS is not a governmental body. *See id.* § 552.003(1)(A) (defining "governmental body"). We note, however, the instant request for information was received by the city. Additionally, the submitted information was sent to the city and is in the city's possession. Section 552.021 of the Government Code provides for public access to "public information," *see id.* § 552.021, which is defined by section 552.002 of the Government Code as "information that is collected, assembled, or maintained under a law or ordinance or in connection with the transaction of official business: (1) by a governmental body; or (2) for a governmental body and the governmental body owns the information or has a right of access to it." *Id.* § 552.002(a). We find the city collected, assembled, or maintains the submitted information in connection with the transaction of its official business. Therefore, we conclude this information is subject to the Act and must be released, unless the information falls within an exception to disclosure under the Act. *See id.* §§ 552.006, .021, .301, .302.

Section 552.110 of the Government Code protects (1) trade secrets and (2) commercial or financial information, the disclosure of which would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained. *Id.* § 552.110. Section 552.110(a) protects the proprietary interests of private parties by excepting from disclosure information that is trade secrets obtained from a person and information that is privileged or confidential by statute or judicial decision. *Id.* § 552.110(a). The Texas Supreme Court has adopted the definition of a "trade secret" from section 757 of the Restatement of Torts. *Hyde Corp. v. Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d 763, 776 (Tex. 1958); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 552 at 2 (1990). Section 757 provides a trade secret to be as follows:

[A]ny formula, pattern, device or compilation of information which is used in one's business, and which gives [one] an opportunity to obtain an advantage over competitors who do not know or use it. It may be a formula for a chemical compound, a process of manufacturing, treating or preserving materials, a pattern for a machine or other device, or a list of customers. It

differs from other secret information in a business . . . in that it is not simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business, as, for example, the amount or other terms of a secret bid for a contract or the salary of certain employees A trade secret is a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business. Generally it relates to the production of goods, as, for example, a machine or formula for the production of an article. It may, however, relate to the sale of goods or to other operations in the business, such as a code for determining discounts, rebates or other concessions in a price list or catalogue, or a list of specialized customers, or a method of bookkeeping or other office management.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (1939) (citation omitted); *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776. In determining whether particular information constitutes a trade secret, this office considers the Restatement's definition of trade secret, as well as the Restatement's list of six trade secret factors.¹ *See* RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b. This office must accept a claim that information subject to the Act is excepted as a trade secret if a *prima facie* case for exemption is made and no argument is submitted that rebuts the claim as a matter of law. ORD 552 at 5-6. However, we cannot conclude that section 552.110(a) is applicable unless it has been shown that the information meets the definition of a trade secret and the necessary factors have been demonstrated to establish a trade secret claim. Open Records Decision No. 402 (1983).

Section 552.110(b) protects “[c]ommercial or financial information for which it is demonstrated based on specific factual evidence that disclosure would cause substantial competitive harm to the person from whom the information was obtained[.]” Gov’t Code § 552.110(b). This exception to disclosure requires a specific factual or evidentiary showing, not conclusory or generalized allegations, that substantial competitive injury would likely result from release of the information at issue. *Id.* § 552.110(b); Open Records Decision No. 661 at 5-6 (1999) (business enterprise must show by specific factual evidence that release of information would cause it substantial competitive harm).

¹There are six factors the Restatement gives as indicia of whether information qualifies as a trade secret:

- (1) the extent to which the information is known outside of [the company's] business;
- (2) the extent to which it is known by employees and others involved in [the company's] business;
- (3) the extent of measures taken by [the company] to guard the secrecy of the information;
- (4) the value of the information to [the company] and to [its] competitors;
- (5) the amount of effort or money expended by [the company] in developing the information;
- and
- (6) the ease or difficulty with which the information could be properly acquired or duplicated by others.

RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b; *see also* Open Records Decision Nos. 319 at 2 (1982), 306 at 2 (1982), 255 at 2 (1980).

DISYS and Sentari claim some of their information constitutes trade secrets. Upon review, however, we find DISYS and Sentari have failed to demonstrate any of their information meets the definition of a trade secret, nor have they demonstrated the necessary factors to establish a trade secret claim for this information. We note pricing information pertaining to a particular proposal or contract is generally not a trade secret because it is "simply information as to single or ephemeral events in the conduct of the business," rather than "a process or device for continuous use in the operation of the business." RESTATEMENT OF TORTS § 757 cmt. b (citation omitted); *see also Huffines*, 314 S.W.2d at 776. Accordingly, the city may not withhold any of the information at issue on the basis of section 552.110(a) of the Government Code.

DISYS and Sentari also contend portions of their information are commercial or financial information, the release of which would cause substantial competitive harm to DISYS and Sentari. Upon review, however, we find DISYS and Sentari have not made the specific factual or evidentiary showing required by section 552.110(b) that release of any their information would cause the companies substantial competitive harm. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 509 at 5 (1988) (because bid specifications and circumstances would change for future contracts, assertion that release of bid proposal might give competitor unfair advantage on future contracts is too speculative), 319 at 3 (statutory predecessor to section 552.110 generally not applicable to information relating to organization and personnel, market studies, professional references, qualifications and experience, and pricing). We note the pricing information of winning bidders of a government contract, such as DISYS and Sentari, is generally not excepted under section 552.110(b). Open Records Decision No. 514 (1988) (public has interest in knowing prices charged by government contractors); *see* ORD 319 at 3. *See generally* Dep't of Justice Guide to the Freedom of Information Act 344-345 (2009) (federal cases applying analogous Freedom of Information Act reasoning that disclosure of prices charged government is cost of doing business with government). Moreover, we believe the public has a strong interest in the release of prices in government contract awards. *See* ORD 514. Therefore, we conclude the city may not withhold any of the information at issue under section 552.110(b) of the Government Code.

Section 552.136(b) of the Government Code states that "[n]otwithstanding any other provision of [the Act], a credit card, debit card, charge card, or access device number that is collected, assembled, or maintained by or for a governmental body is confidential."² Gov't Code § 552.136(b). This office has determined that insurance policy numbers are access device numbers for purposes of section 552.136. *See id.* § 552.136(a) (defining "access device"). Therefore, the city must withhold the information we have marked pursuant to section 552.136 of the Government Code. As no further exceptions to disclosure are raised, the remaining information must be released.

²The Office of the Attorney General will raise a mandatory exception on behalf of a governmental body, but ordinarily will not raise other exceptions. *See* Open Records Decision Nos. 481 (1987), 480 (1987), 470 (1987).

This letter ruling is limited to the particular information at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other information or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For more information concerning those rights and responsibilities, please visit our website at http://www.oag.state.tx.us/open/index_orl.php, or call the Office of the Attorney General's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. Questions concerning the allowable charges for providing public information under the Act must be directed to the Cost Rules Administrator of the Office of the Attorney General, toll free, at (888) 672-6787.

Sincerely,



Sarah Casterline
Assistant Attorney General
Open Records Division

SEC/tch

Ref: ID# 482099

Enc. Submitted documents

c: Requestor
(w/o enclosures)

Ms. Mary Necessary
President and CEO
Sentari Technologies, Inc.
16775 Addison Road, Suite 600
Addison, Texas 75001
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Areej Faiz
Contracts Specialist
Digital Intelligence Systems Corp.
8270 Greensboro Drive, Suite 1000
McLean, Virginia 22102
(w/o enclosures)

Mr. Scott Price
Account Manager
Matrix Resources, Inc.
4851 LBJ Freeway, Suite 700
Dallas, Texas 75244
(w/o enclosures)

Hudson Global Resources Management,
Inc.
14001 Dallas Parkway, Suite 1210
Dallas, Texas 75240
(w/o enclosures)

